me Court which is expected to help reduce the backlog of cases considerably.

(g) Rceently Hon. the Chief Justice has directed that the counsel in each matter should file written arguments, if the arguments are to take more than five hours on each side. The oral arguments on each side are not restricted to five hours unless the Court feels that more time is to be given to the counsel in which case a maximum of ten hours are given for oral arguments by consel of each side. The length of oral arguments by counsel of both the sides has thus been curtailed with a view to securing quick disposal of matters.

(h) A court Administrator-cum-Registrar General, who is a senior judical officer, has been appointed so that in conjunction with the present two Registrars there can be a reorganisation of the working of the Registry and improving its techniques and efficiency.

Vacancies of Judges in Delhi High Court

1083. SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:

SHRI T. R. BALU:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) how many vacancies of Judges are there in the High Court of Delhi as on date;

(b) what is their present strength;

(c) how many vacancies have been filled in during the last three years, yearwise;

(d) how many cases are pending in the Court, categorywise and how many of them are three, five and ten years old; and

(e) what steps are being taken to dispose of the long pending cases?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): (a) and (b) As on 28-2-1989, the sanctioned strength of the Delhi High Court was 25 permanent Judges and 2 Additional Judges, and 22 Judges were in position, leaving 3 vacancies of permanent Judges and 2 vacancies of Additional Judges.

(c) In the Delhi High Court, 6 Judges were appointed in 1986, 1 Judge in 1987 and 2 Judges in 1988.

(d) As per information received, as on 30.6.1988, a total number of 82712 cases (Civil....78545 and Criminal....4167) was pending in the Delhi High Court. The number of cases pending for over 3, 5 and 10 years is given below:

	Civil	Criminal	Total
Over 3 Years	36935	1863	38798
Over 5 Years	22490	1197	23687
Over 10 Years	5316	53	5369

(e) Recommendations for reducing arrears, based on a Report by a Committee of three Chief Justices, have been sent to all the High Court for appropriate action. The sanctioned strength of the Delhi High Court has been raised from 21 (in March, 1977) to 27 (in February, 1988).

Filing of Income Tax returns by Chairman, Indian Express Group

1094. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Will the Minister of FINNCE be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2461 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 1st December, 1988 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that till date the Chairman of Indian Express, Shri Ram Nath Goenka has not filed his returns for the assessment year 1987-88 and 1988-89; and

(b) if so, what steps are being taken by Government in the matter and what penalty has been imposed for late/not filing the returns?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI AJIT PANJA): (a) Shri Ram Nath Goenka has filed his income tax return for the assessment year 1987-88 on 29th December, 1988, but not the reurn for the assessment year 1988-89.

(b) A notice under section 139(2) of the Income-Tax Act has been issued by the Assessing Officer requiring the assessee to furnish the return for the assessment year 1988-89.

A penalty under section 271(1)(a) can be imposed only after the completion of the assessment for the relevant year. As the assessments for the two aforesaid assessment years have not been made, the Assessing Officer has so far not imposed any Penalty under section 271(1)(a) of the Act for the said years.

Payment of customs duty on DMT plant by M/s. Bombay Dyeing

1095. SHRI BHAGATRAM MANHAR:

SHRI RAMSINH RATHWA:

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH:

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Collector of Customs, Bombay had confirmed the duty amount of Rs. 2,54,,15,856/- on the value of US $5.5 million being dismantling charges on the import of DMT plant by M/s. Bombay Dyeing;

(b) whether the Company has paid the duty as confirmed by the collector; and

(c) if not, what steps Government have taken to realise the amount?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI AJIT PANJA): (a) Collector of Customs, Bombay has confirmed a demand of Customs duty amounting to Rs. 2,54,15,846/- in respect of import of a DMT plant by M/s. Bombay Dyeing. Out of this amount, a sum of Rs. 22,07,043/- pertains to duty on spares imported by the Company in excess of the 10 per cent of the value of main equipment, and the balance amount of Rs. 2,32,08,803/- pertains to duty on the value of US $5.5 million dismantling charges.

(b) M/s. Bombay Dyeing have not paid the duty as the recovery has been stayed by Customs, Excise and Gold (Control) Appellate Tribunal (CEGAT).

(c) The Department has filed a Miscellaneous Application before CEGAT for expeditious hearing of the matter by the CEGAT.